



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/573,137	09/18/2006	Wataru Ikeda	P36312-02	6947

42212 7590 12/17/2009
PANASONIC PATENT CENTER
1130 CONNECTICUT AVENUE NW, SUITE 1100
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

DAZENSKI, MARC A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2621

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

12/17/2009

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

kamata.kenji@jp.panasonic.com
ppc@us.panasonic.com
odedrad@us.panasonic.com

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 10/573,137	Applicant(s) IKEDA ET AL.	
	Examiner MARC DAZENSKI	Art Unit 2621	

All Participants:

(1) MARC DAZENSKI.

(2) Kerry Culpepper.

Date of Interview: 2 December 2009

Type of Interview:
☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Status of Application: Final

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Time: 11am

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:
101 rejection to claim 6.

Claims discussed:
Claim 6.

Prior art documents discussed:
Tsumagari (US PgPub 2003/0161615)

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Informed applicant that claim 6 would be allowable if "non-transitory" were added before "computer readable medium" in the preamble of claim 6, and if he agreed that the claimed "computer readable medium" was in fact "instruction ROM (24)" in figure 16, as well as lines 25-26 of page 30. Applicant declined and instead expressed desire to pursue a proposed amendment to claim 6 that would change it from a program claim to a method claim. I informed the applicant that the proposed claim amendment as presented would be rejected under 101 as not being tied to any particular machine. Applicant then agreed to an Examiner Initiated Interview at a future date no later than 7 December 2009 in order to discuss possible claim amendments that would circumvent the 101 rejection to the proposed amendment and therefore put the case in condition for allowance.

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

/MARC DAZENSKI/
 Examiner, Art Unit 2621

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)